

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-25 are pending in this patent application. Claims 8-12 are currently amended, without prejudice to the presentation of their original claim scope in a continuing patent application. No new matter is being introduced by entry of these amendments.

Claims 1-7 and 13-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,452,604 to Sato in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,391 to Quadranti, et al. Claims 8-12 stand objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim. Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the examiner's indication that claims 20-25 are allowed.

#### Objections to Claims 8-12

The examiner has further indicated that claims 8-12 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As each of claims 8-12 have been rewritten in independent form based on claim 1 (as previously amended), applicant respectfully requests that the examiner issue a notice of allowability as to these claims.

#### 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejections of Claims 1-7 and 13-19

Claims 1-7 and 13-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,452,604 to Sato in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,391 to Quadranti, et al. Applicant respectfully disagrees with, and traverses, the stated grounds for rejection. As described below, the claims recite various features that are neither taught nor suggested by the prior art. Applicant thus submits that all of the claims are novel and non-obvious over the prior art of record.

Below, applicant discusses various claim features that define over the prior art of record.

Claim 1 is directed towards a texture generating apparatus including the element of "a rendering portion coupled to said texture coordinates generator adapted to provide renderability of the texture onto the objects in the design" The texture referred to is, as stated in the claim, "a texture visually indicating the spatial relationship between the modeled objects."

This rendering of a texture visually indicating the spatial relationship between modeled objects is not present in either Sato or in Quadranti. Sato does not deal with texture generation or application. Quadranti generally deals with the analysis and classification of texture, not the application of texture. Quadranti, column 2, lines 18-36. While different features of textures are described as being possible in Quadranti, such as the features tested in Quadranti's Tests 1-4 (column 3, lines 40-58), there is no indication in Quadranti that the textural features are or should be related to the proximity of any object to any other object. Thus the claimed rendering portion of the claimed texture generating apparatus of applicant's claim 1 is not taught or suggested by Sato, Quadranti, or any combination thereof.

Because, as discussed above, the applicant maintains that the elements of claim 1 are neither taught nor suggested in Sato in view of Quadranti, claims 2-7, which are dependent on claim 1, are similarly not taught or suggested in the prior art. In addition, specific features of these dependent claims are not found in Underwood. Claim 7 includes the limitation that the texture generator is adapted to access a proximity value characterizing a spatial relationship between objects in a design. While Quadranti does disclose that textures may have characteristics, it does not disclose that these characteristics have any meaning. The textures in Quadranti are merely being analyzed for classification. No characteristic is disclosed in Quadranti as being related to the proximity of objects.

The examiner has used the rationale of claim 1 to reject claim 13. With respect to claim 13, applicant refers to the remarks above with respect to claim 1. Because, the applicant maintains that the elements of claim 13 are neither taught nor suggested in Sato in view of Quadranti, claims 14-19, which are dependent on claim 13, are similarly not taught or suggested in the prior art.

#### Conclusion

Applicant thus respectfully submits that all of the claims 1-7 and 13-19 are novel and non-obvious over the prior art of record.

For all of the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully submit that this case is now in condition for allowance, and an early notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-1198  
**Application No.:** 09/727,985  
**Office Action Dated:** August 28, 2003

**PATENT**

Date: December 29, 2003



---

Sharon Fenick  
Registration No. 45,269

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor  
Philadelphia PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439